

REMARKS:

Status Of Claims

Claims 1-19 and 26-37 were previously and are currently pending in the application with claims 1, 26, and 28 being independent.

Office Action

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 26-37 have been allowed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With regard to “a portion of the data”, claim 1 actually recites “storing a portion of the data relating to the spatial region in a memory buffer”. Applicant intends this limitation of claim 1 to mean ‘at least some portion’ of the data that relates to the spatial region is stored in a memory buffer. This stored portion could be all of the data, or only a portion thereof. Applicant does not believe we are required to specify exactly how much of the data is stored in the buffer. With regard to “predetermined prioritized order”, as used in claims 1 and 5, Applicant means that the prioritized order in which the portion of the memory buffer cells are searched is ‘determined before the search begins’. With regard to asserted lack of antecedent basis rejections, Applicant notes that each word or phrase is first proceeded by “a”, “an”, or no article at all. Applicant believes this to be proper practice. The words or phrases themselves are used in and/or otherwise supported by the specification. Applicant believes these to be normal

usage of the above terms. While correction does not appear to be required, Applicant is more than willing to entertain whatever suggestions the Examiner might have and the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss the matter further.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Morimoto et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 20010051947. Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims distinguish the present invention from Morimoto and the other prior art references of record, taken alone or in combination with each other.

Specifically, claim 1 recites “identifying a search vector through the spatial region, the search vector having a starting point, a direction **and** a length”, emphasis added.

In contrast, throughout his application Morimoto always places an “or” between distance and orientation. In other words, Morimoto only teaches distance **or** orientation. Nowhere does Morimoto even suggest distance **and** orientation. Thus, Morimoto simply fails to disclose, suggest or make obvious “identifying a search vector through the spatial region, the search vector having a starting point, a direction **and** a length”, emphasis added, as claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that Morimoto teaches “storing a portion of the data relating to the spatial region in a memory buffer having memory cells representative of the search vector such that spatial region data corresponding to the search vector is stored in memory cells representative of the search vector”, as claimed in claim 1. However, Morimoto does not even include the word “buffer”, much less any teaching of “storing a

portion of the data relating to the spatial region in a memory buffer having memory cells representative of the search vector such that spatial region data corresponding to the search vector is stored in memory cells representative of the search vector". Furthermore, the Examiner doesn't even assert that Morimoto teaches or suggests "searching a portion of the memory buffer cells in a predetermined prioritized order" or "comparing a value stored in the memory cell with a predetermined search criteria independent of flight path angle", as also claimed in claim 1.

As a result, Morimoto simply fails to teach or even suggest most, if not all, of the limitations of claim 1, and the present anticipation rejections simple cannot be sustained.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,115. A terminal disclaimer accompanies this amendment, in order to obviate this ground of rejection.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 501-791. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David L. Terrell/
David L. Terrell, Reg. No. 50,576
Garmin International, Inc.
1200 East 151st Street
Olathe, KS 66062
(913) 397-8200

Application No. 10/720,371
Response dated June 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 6, 2006

(913) 397-9079 (Fax)